6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

562 611 [583] *korobka* (chest) of her own. When a girl married, she took her korobka, together with the property given her by her father or brothers, to her new home as a dowry and was allowed to dispose freely of it. At the same time her husband was not responsible for her debts.[10] When a married woman died, if childless, her [428] korobka, as a rule, returned to her mother (matrilineal succession) and only if her mother was not alive, to her father. In some provinces the husband would inherit his wife's property if he lived with her four years or more.[11] If she had children, her property was inherited by both sons and daughters equally.[12]

Matriarchal traits are evident in contemporary folk philosophy and many folk customs in the Bielorussian villages as well as in some parts of the Ukraine. In the oral poetry of these [772] people, for instance, the sun is represented as a female who is wooing the moon, her bridegroom. In some songs of these peasant folk the maidens contend with the male youths in duels and defeat them.[13] Even today in some of these regions it is often the girls who take the initiative in finding their suitors. During harvest festivals, it is the maidens who play the leading part. Traces [583] of the capture of the bridegroom still persist in the folk customs of the Ukraine. In Ukrainian and Bielorussian folk poetry [593] women, especially the mother, play a very significant role, while the place of the father is less outstanding. In popular opinion in this area, the consent of the mother in the marriage of a daughter is considered more important than that of the father.

• 582 Marriage among the Old-Slavonic peasant folk was endogamous within the village community and perhaps even within the joint household community (*verv, zadruga*)—not unlike in the Croatian zadruga of our days.[14] There was also, apparently, 593 a particularly developed brother-sister attachment as is manifested by brother-sister incest which seems to have taken place occasionally in some Russian regions until recently.[15] There were, therefore, abundant opportunities for emotional attachments in the Old-Slavonic family, since there were no external political, economic, or social pressures that might have disturbed internal equalitarian family relationships. Such relationships have persisted until present times in certain parts of Ukraine:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

(*sud*). Accordingly, in the mind of these people, the universe and peace (*mir*) were also identical.[28]

Great calamities occasionally befell the Old-Slavonic communities—frequent raids and plundering by the invaders and slave hunters; then cattle plagues and epidemics. These were thought to have been brought on by certain demons and malevolent ghosts, but the Polesie people knew of ways to cope even with such disasters. Contagious diseases were prevented or stopped by means of magic, especially by the magical powers of women. As for their enemies, the soil cultivators of the Dnieper basin were not prepared for any offensive or defensive warfare and were an easy prey for many aggressors. Being not armed, their defense consisted of hiding themselves. They sought safety in impenetrable marshes and forests and even resorted to such ruses as lying submerged on the bottoms of marshes and breathing by means of cane sticks until the danger was over.[29]

Since the Old-Slavonic agriculturists contracted their marriage unions early in life, as a means of labor supply and since they were not exposed to exhaustion of constant warfare, the region which they originally inhabited soon reached its limits of population. Thus, in spite of their autarchic and intensive agricultural techniques and their attachment to the soil, the early Slav folk were forced to leave their original habitat in search of new lands. They did not migrate in a fury and did not traverse great distances like the mounted nomads of the steppes; rather, they moved slowly and quietly for short distances and by stages always keeping in touch with the mother community from which they had sprung.

In this manner the Old-Slavonic tillers penetrated new regions and territories, not by force and conquest like the predatory steppe raiders, but by cultivating new soil along the river basins, in the midst of forest clearings, drained marshes or irrigated steppes. Living in village communities which remained ethnically uninterrupted, they transplanted and perpetuated in their new homes their native agricultural techniques, their beliefs and customs, their family and community organization, as well as their philosophy of life. Thus as late as the twentieth century, the social organization and personality traits of the Zadruga peo-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

Family centrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's neighbor were apparently projected into the supernatural world where one's own Domovoy, though at times arbitrary, ill-tempered and spiteful, was generally considered to be benevolent—bringing good luck to the household which was under his care and solicitude. The neighbor's Domovoy, on the other hand, was always a malevolent and wicked being who could never be propitiated and who was likely to steal your hay or drive away your cattle for the benefit of the home which was under his protection. The Russian peasants, therefore, developed means of defense against the neighbor's Domovoy in the form of spells and exorcisms.

Lack of social trust is not favorable to the development of solidarity within a community. Therefore lack of group identification among the peasants and burghers, the same as the lack of the *esprit de corps* among the nobility, contributed to the perpetuation of the autocratic rule. Lack of communal identifications was an obstacle to the turning of group hostilities against the ruling classes. In such circumstances a great deal of personal aggressiveness had to find outlets and targets within the local community and within the family circle itself. Only when the authorities suffered crushing defeat and loss of prestige the hostilities would turn against them and mass uprisings would take place, demanding re-establishment of old communal values.

With the ascendancy of the otsovskaya system, family relations came to be organized in a hierarchical system along the lines of paternity, marriage status, seniority and sex. At one time, only married male members formed the family council (soviet). The males had priority over the females. Within each sex category the elder had priority rights over the younger. When the family was partitioned, custom demanded that the older brothers leave the ancestral home while the youngest, following Mongol traditions, remained on the paternal *koren* (root).[4] In marrying the daughters it was the eldest who had to be married first.

In the patriarchal family, in their relations to the father, all family members were expected to accept his rule with fear and awe (*strakh*) and with humility (*smirenie*). They had to show absolute submission and blind obedience (*besprekoslovnoe povinovenie*),[5] as well as love and gratitude (*blagodarnost*).[6]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

II

[582] 606 Perhaps as a result of family centeredness and the need of keeping a distance from one's neighbor, there developed the practice of looking for the bride not in one's own but in another, more remote locality. Brides from afar, who did not have an opportunity to keep frequent contact with their own parents, were considered not only more amenable to control and easier to assimilate, but less dangerous from the point of view of the family's collective responsibility and isolation. "Do not buy a horse nor marry a daughter of your neighbor: both will run away"; "Get a wife from afar, buy a cow from near," the people would say.

[584] Very often there was nothing for a girl to look forward to in her new family. Her mate was not of her choice; he and his family were often complete strangers to her. She might not have even seen any of them before the day of her marriage. Wedding songs always refer to the bridegroom, his home, his father, and his village as "the abode of the strangers," "the unknown, far off land." As soon as the father had "stuck the hands" with the match-maker, the bride-to-be would start to lament and implore her father not to "give her away to the strangers." On the eve of the bride's marriage, her girl friends would come to her home and spend all evening singing *piesni plachevia*—"weeping songs,"[10] while the bride would cry and wail continuously. In these songs the future bride imagines herself as being left completely alone and without any affection in a distant, unknown and unfriendly world.[11]

[538] The anxieties and fears felt by the bride when going away to marry a stranger in a "strange land" might have found, perhaps, a symbolic expression in the *Zmey* tales. Zmey is a mythical being whose function is to deceive and rape young maidens and keep them forever in captivity. In the Great-Russian folk tales the Zmey is pictured as a terrifying "winged" and "many-headed" monster which throws fire from his nostrils and his mouth, but assumes the form of a youth of marvelous beauty before he abducts his victim.[12]

The prospect of the bride's relations with her husband's

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

178 In the new secularized and urbanized society, also, the position
565 of the clergy became increasingly precarious. Like other insti-
793 tutions of the Czardom the Russian Orthodox Church was organ-
ized along the lines of sharp social differentiation and domi-
nance-submission relationships. Russian Orthodox clergy as a
whole formed a closed caste institution. All lay clergymen and
many monastics were recruited from among the members of the
[582] families of lay clergy. Endogamous marriage was practiced
within this caste. The church maintained its own schools for
both the sons and the daughters of clergymen. In this manner
[184] the clergy had been separated from the rest of the society and
had developed a sub-culture of its own. The clerics were set
apart from others not only by their priestly garb, but by their
manners, and even by their names.

792 Internally, however, within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy
793 there was a sharp distinction between the monastic order (black
554 clergy) and the secular priesthood (white clergy). The monastic
order was rich in land donations and other possessions and all
the Church hierarchy was recruited from among its ranks. The
secular clergy was not only subordinate to the monastics, but
also poor. Among the secular clergy sharp class distinction ex-
isted between the city clergy and the village priests. This dif-
ferentiation was manifested in the differences in income, educa-
tion and prestige, as well as in the lack of intermarriage between
these strata. The difference was also reflected in the attitudes of
[364] the laity. While the city clergy were socially accepted by the mid-
dle and lower urban layers, the village priests were rather iso-
lated from the rest of the population.

However, the sharpest difference and social distance existed between the Church hierarchy and the rank-and-file clergymen. The heads of monasteries, for instance, behaved like real magnates. They took in large revenues, kept servants, horses and carriages, and hardly shared in the life of their monastic brothers, even though these Church dignitaries resided in monasteries. In the same way, the bishops were inclined to belittle the lay clergy under their control. They treated them with a great want of respect. They would abuse them, insult them and then even flog them.

2/4 [i.e. developing in the second half of the XIXth century -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

duct of its members in love and family life run counter to the ethics of Soviet Man."[11] The fundamental motivation behind this interference in love and sex life is political control. "Moral corruption brings political corruption,"[12] the Bolsheviks say. It is in accordance with such a line of thought that it is considered to be the duty of one to inform on his or her own spouse. Such behavior is especially expected of a Party member. Therefore "A prudent Russian today hesitates to confide in even his wife too fully."[13]

At the same time while the Soviet family laws and Soviet philosophy and practices tend to favor Party and government supervision of family relations and in some cases sharpen family conflicts, they also endeavor to enforce family discipline over children, and to strengthen the sense of mutual responsibility among family members. The Bolsheviks, however, do not encourage development of the sense of kinship loyalty which might go counter to the interests of the state. The Soviet family laws have broadened the concept of family to all ascending and descending lines and to brothers and sisters. In case any one of these relatives is needy or incapacitated, the others have the obligation of support.[14] Emphasis on family responsibility is manifested also in the provision of the law of 1926 which, contrary to the Russian traditions, abolished the principle of separate property of the spouses.[15]

In accordance with new policy, factual or non-registered marriage which earlier enjoyed state protection was denied that privilege and a decree in 1944 ruled that "only registered marriage confers the rights and obligations of spouses."[16] A decree of the same year ruled that divorce is allowed only in case the wish of one or even both parties who seek divorce coincides with the "government's recognition of necessity to dissolve marriage."[17] Moreover in order to make divorce proceeding prohibitive and marriage practically indissoluble, a long judicial procedure was established. In the course of this long procedure the parties must clarify the motives for divorce and bring witnesses. Also high divorce fees were introduced. And to facilitate state interference, nó grounds for divorce were stated or specified in the decree.

However, the procedural instructions concerning this decree